



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

9

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,126	12/15/2003	Patricia Alice McParland	384.7879USU	5765
7590	05/01/2006		EXAMINER	
Paul D. Greeley, Esq. Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P. 10th Floor One Landmark Square Stamford, CT 06901-2682			KAZIMI, HANI M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	
DATE MAILED: 05/01/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/736,126	MCPARLAND ET AL.	
	Examiner Hani Kazimi	Art Unit 3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on January 20, 2006.

Claims 1-20 are pending. The rejections cited are as stated below:

Summary of this Office Action

2. Applicants' amendment and arguments filed on January 20, 2006 have been fully considered, and discussed in the next section below or within the following rejection are not deemed to be persuasive. Therefore, claims 1-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over the art cited below, and Applicants' request for allowance is respectfully denied.

Response to Applicants' Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Early et al. US Patent Publication No. 2003/0004868 A1 (hereinafter "Early").

Claims 1-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Early as discussed in paragraph 6 of the previous office action mailed on October 11, 2005. Further:

Early discloses that the aggressive value and the conservative value are co-existing (column 2, par. [0020], and fig. 3c), Early states "To track the cardholder's use, a Tier 1 and a Tier 2 limit may be established for the cardholder. For example, the Tier 2 limit may correspond to the credit limit of the account, while the Tier 1 limit may correspond to a lower limit signaling when the Tier 2 limit is close to being exceeded".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 148 USPQ 459, that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or unobviousness.

7. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Early et al. US Patent Publication No. 2003/0004868 A1 (hereinafter "Early").

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Early as discussed in paragraph 9 of the previous office action mailed on October 11, 2005.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant argues in substance that;

The prior art reference (Early) "... does not disclose producing two credit limit values that exist at the same time for the same account holder ...". Tier 2 value is not a value independent from Tier 1 value. "In contrast, the invention of claim 1 provides two co-existing credit limit values, each providing a separate credit limit value based on separate criteria ...".

In response to the above argument:

As indicated above, Early clearly discloses the step of producing two credit limit values that exist at the same time for the same account holder, (column 2, par. [0020], and fig. 3c), Early states "To track the cardholder's use, a Tier 1 and a Tier 2 limit may be established for the cardholder. Early provides two co-existing credit limit values, each providing a separate credit limit value. In response to Applicant's argument

that the references fail to show certain features of Applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the credit limit values are independent from one another and are based on separate criteria) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The difference between the Early reference and Applicant's invention is that, Early discloses in details how these credit limit values are created and established, where Applicant's specification just introduces these credit limit values but silent on how they're created.

Conclusion

9. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hani Kazimi whose telephone number is (571) 272-6745. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).



HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 3624

April 3, 2006